

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Robyn Howell	Team: Team # 4	CCRB Case #: 200807500	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Sunday, 05/25/2008 , Monday, 05/26/2008 9:34 PM	Location of Incident: Rear of § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 101	18 Mo. SOL 11/26/2009	EO SOL 11/26/2009	
Date/Time CV Reported Wed, 05/28/2008 8:54 AM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Wed, 05/28/2008 8:54 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Jason Ragoo	01854	939268	101PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Jason Ragoo	Abuse: PO Jason Ragoo questioned § 87(2)(b) on May 26, 2008.	
B.POM Jason Ragoo	Abuse: PO Jason Ragoo frisked § 87(2)(b) on May 26, 2008.	
C.POM Jason Ragoo	Abuse: PO Jason Ragoo searched § 87(2)(b) on May 26, 2008.	

Synopsis

On May 28, 2008, § 87(2)(b) filed a complaint against PO Jason Ragoo of the 101st Precinct. He reported that on May 26, 2008 at approximately 9:34PM, he had left his mother's house located at § 87(2)(b) in Queens. He was walking down a walkway at the back of the apartment building. Three officers came up the walkway. PO Ragoo, who was identified by his badge, approached § 87(2)(b) and asked for his identification (**Allegation A**). § 87(2)(b) asked what was the problem and PO Ragoo told him that there was a shooting in the area. PO Ragoo then frisked § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation B**). After that he searched § 87(2)(b)'s front and back pockets (**Allegation C**). PO Ragoo removed his cell phone, the battery, and two pieces of paper from § 87(2)(b)'s right front pocket and then put the items back in his pocket. PO Ragoo asked § 87(2)(b) if he had any warrants and he replied no. PO Ragoo then told one of the officers to check if § 87(2)(b) had warrants. The check came back negative and § 87(2)(b) was free to leave.

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Summary of Complaint

§ 87(2)(b) was interviewed at the CCRB on July 10, 2008 (Encl.5A-D). On May 26, 2008, § 87(2)(b) was coming from visiting his family at § 87(2)(b) in Far Rockaway, Queens. As he was walking down the walkway at the back entrance of the building, he saw three officers about 100 feet in front of him walking in his direction. PO Ragoo, who was described as 5'9", about 150 or 160 pounds, light brown complexion, clean shaven, with short dark cropped hair and of either Asian, Indian, or Guyanese descent, approached him. § 87(2)(b) read his name from his badge and asked him how to pronounce it. At the time of § 87(2)(b)'s interview, he identified PO Ragoo by name and correctly spelled it. PO2, was described as a white male, 6 feet tall with an average build and clean shaven, and PO3, was described as a white male, approximately 5'8" or 5'9". He did not get a good look at the two other officers because they stood off to the side and were not in clear view. Those officers remain unknown. PO Ragoo stood approximately one foot away from § 87(2)(b)'s face. PO Ragoo put the palm of his hand over § 87(2)(b)'s heart. § 87(2)(b) asked him what he was doing and PO Ragoo replied that he was questioning people in the area regarding a shooting that had occurred at the location. § 87(2)(b) asked him why he stopped him and PO Ragoo told him about incidents that had happened prior to May 26, 2008. § 87(2)(b) asked him what did that have to do with him and PO Ragoo asked him if he was a resident of the building and § 87(2)(b) replied that he was not and he lived in Brooklyn. PO Ragoo asked him where he came from and § 87(2)(b) replied that he came from visiting family who lived in § 87(2)(b). PO Ragoo wrote that information down on a notepad.

PO Ragoo asked § 87(2)(b) if he had any warrants and he said no. He asked him for his ID and § 87(2)(b) provided it. PO2 took § 87(2)(b)'s ID and checked over the radio to see if he had any warrants. The information came back over the radio that he did not have any warrants. PO2 then gave § 87(2)(b)'s ID back to PO Ragoo and PO Ragoo returned § 87(2)(b)'s ID. § 87(2)(b) told PO Ragoo that he did not want to be searched. PO Ragoo however told § 87(2)(b) to move to some columns which was part of the buildings infrastructure, and told him to place his hands on them. PO Ragoo frisked § 87(2)(b)'s arms, waist area, legs, and ankles. PO Ragoo had a pen in his hand and he stuck it between § 87(2)(b)'s ankles and shoes. At that point, § 87(2)(b) asked PO Ragoo what he was doing and told him that he was going to be held responsible because he did not give him permission to search him. PO Ragoo continued to frisk § 87(2)(b) from the ankles up. He patted around § 87(2)(b)'s crotch area and then touched his crotch with a pen. He also went inside of § 87(2)(b)'s small pocket near his waistband on his jeans and pulled out his cell phone, the battery, and pieces of paper with information on it. PO Ragoo looked at the items and then put them back into § 87(2)(b)'s pocket. After PO Ragoo searched him, § 87(2)(b) asked again why he stopped and searched him and PO Ragoo did not respond. § 87(2)(b) was then free to leave. He went back into the building and one of his family's next door neighbors, he did not know his name, asked him why PO Ragoo

searched him and § 87(2)(b) said “You seen him.” PO2 and PO3 had no interaction with § 87(2)(b) was not arrested or issued a summons.

On January 23, 2009, a contact attempt was made to § 87(2)(b) to clarify the incident date but he was unable to speak at that time. On January 26, 2009, § 87(2)(b) was successfully contacted and informed that there was a discrepancy regarding the date of incident because NYPD documents indicated that PO Ragoo did not work on May 26, 2008. § 87(2)(b) stated that the incident happened on the night of Memorial Day. He was asked about notes that he took about the incident after his interaction with PO Ragoo and he stated that he simply wrote down the date and time of incident, PO Ragoo’s name and his badge number. § 87(2)(b) was not sure whether he kept or discarded the paper with that information.

In addition to that, § 87(2)(b) stated that approximately two weeks after the incident, a resident of the building asked him if he had police contact on Memorial Day because he heard § 87(2)(b)’s information being put over the radio as he listened to his police scanner in his apartment. § 87(2)(b) did not know the name of that individual or where he lived in the building.

On February 4, 2009, § 87(2)(b) was successfully contacted and he was asked if he could provide his mother’s telephone number so that the undersigned investigator could speak with her to confirm the incident date since § 87(2)(b) stated that after the incident, he went back to his mother’s house. § 87(2)(b) stated that his mother would most likely not remember the incident because he did not really discuss it with her, but he spoke to his nephew § 87(2)(b) about what happened. § 87(2)(b) and his girlfriend were at his mother’s house cooking dinner on the night of the incident.

On June 4, 2009, § 87(2)(b) viewed photos of six officers in a single photo array (Encl.5F). PO Ragoo’s photo was in box number 5 and the other officers were fillers. § 87(2)(b) immediately identified PO Ragoo as the officer that temporarily detained and searched him on the date of incident.

Results of Investigation

Attempts to Locate and Identify Additional Witnesses

§ 87(2)(b) provided his nephew, § 87(2)(b) contact information because he stated that he spoke to § 87(2)(b) right after his interaction with PO Ragoo and that he would be able to confirm the incident date and time. On March 9, 2009, § 87(2)(b) was successfully contacted and he stated that he was certain that the incident happened on May 26, 2008, Memorial Day, because he intended to go to the Memorial Day Parade but changed his mind. That night, while he was at his grandmother’s house located at § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(b) told him about his interaction with PO Ragoo.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that one of his family’s neighbors, who he could not identify by name and did not have contact information for, asked him why PO Ragoo searched him. Attempts to get contact information for that individual were made through § 87(2)(b) on January 23, and 26, 2009. On January 26, 2009, § 87(2)(b) stated that he would locate the individual and provide him with the undersigned investigator’s contact information. On February 4, 2009 § 87(2)(b) was contacted and said he was unable to locate the witness. Follow-up contact attempts to § 87(2)(b) were made on February 10, and 17 of 2009. On March 2, 2009, § 87(2)(b) had not located the individual.

Officer Identification

PO Ragoo was interviewed as the subject officer because § 87(2)(b) identified PO Ragoo by name from reading it off of his uniform during their interaction. PO Ragoo also matched § 87(2)(b)’s description of him. § 87(2)(b) described PO Ragoo as either Asian, Indian, or Guyanese, approximately 5’8” or 5’9” and about 150 to 160 pounds. According to NYPD records, PO Ragoo is Asian, 5’7”, and 185 pounds. § 87(2)(b) also positively identified him in a photo array. PO Ragoo was assigned to the 101st Precinct which was the precinct of occurrence on May 26, 2008, and is the only officer within the NYPD whose last name is Ragoo.

Officer Statements

PO Ragoo is currently assigned to PSA 2. At the time of the incident, he was assigned to the 101st Precinct.

PO Ragoo was interviewed at the CCRB on July 13, 2009 (Encl.7A-C). PO Ragoo was informed that he was notified for May 25, 2008 instead of May 26, 2008 which was because although § 87(2)(b) stated the incident happened on May 26, 2008, PO Ragoo's memo book indicated that he was RDO on that date. The most logical date the incident could have occurred was May 25, 2008 since PO Ragoo worked overtime. PO Ragoo was also informed that § 87(2)(b) positively identified him by name and in a photo array.

On May 25, 2008, PO Ragoo worked from 8:00PM to 4:35AM. His assignment was an overtime foot post at the incident location. He worked by himself and was in uniform. At the time of incident, he worked in his uniform. PO Ragoo had no recollection of the incident. His memo book did not have any entries related to this incident. PO Ragoo was shown a photograph of § 87(2)(b) and he did not recognize him. He did not recall stopping § 87(2)(b) on May 26, 2008 or any other date.

PO Ragoo did not remember if his superior officers gave him specific instructions to look for anyone or anything at the incident location and he did not recall investigating any specific crime that may have occurred in the area prior to the date of incident. PO Ragoo did not recall stopping anyone on May 25, 2008 at 54 Beach Channel Drive during his tour. He stated that when he was assigned to the 101st Precinct, he was assigned at foot post at Edgemere Houses which is the name the housing development located at § 87(2)(b). He further stated that the residents of that housing development knew him by name. He was given a brief synopsis of the incident and he still had no recollection of the incident.

An extensive review of PO Ragoo's memo book for relevant entries regarding this incident on different days was also conducted. The undersigned investigator searched for stops of individuals close to the date of incident and ordered the reports to confirm that those individuals were the stops actually listed in PO Ragoo's memo book. PO Ragoo's fly pages in his memo book were also requested in an attempt to see if PO Ragoo mentioned anything regarding this incident on them and they did not. After May 25, 2008 entries, the next time that PO Ragoo reported to work was at 5:30PM on May 27, 2008.

Department Advocate's Office

§ 87(2)(b). The ICO confirmed that PO Ragoo was not paid for any overtime on May 26, 2008 aside from the overtime he worked on the morning of May 26, 2008. This indicates that he did not work any overtime details for outside commands on May 26, 2008.

Communication Records

A Sprint request for May 26, 2008 regarding a shooting or other serious offense around the date and time of the incident yielded negative results.

SPIA from the 101st Precinct

A request for all of the jobs from May 24 to May 28 of 2008 indicated that there were no jobs for May 26, 2008 in the vicinity of the incident location.

Results of Warrant Inquiries

A MISD check for § 87(2)(b) for May 26, 2008 yielded negative results indicating that his license was not run for warrants on that date. A New York State Police Check for May 26, 2008 also yielded negative results. However it indicated that a check for warrants for § 87(2)(b) was conducted on May 5, 2008 at 11:24PM.

A stop and frisk report was thus requested for § 87(2)(b) for May 5, 2008 and there was no report for him. A roll call from the 101st Precinct for the date and time of the warrant check on May 5, 2008 was ordered, and PO Ragoo was not assigned to work on May 5, 2008.

A Sprint request for May 5, 2008 for the incident location for any serious offense also yielded negative results.

Police Documents

Stop and Frisk Reports

Stop and Frisk logs were requested from the 101st Precinct from May 23 through May 30 of 2008 (Encl.9A-Z). § 87(2)(b) was not listed on the logs for any of those dates as being stopped by PO Ragoo or any other officer. Out of the entire list of stop and frisk logs, only four individuals refused to provide their names when they were stopped on May 24, 2008. Those individuals however were stopped by PO Patrick Jean-Pierre, who was assigned to Patrol Borough Queens Task Force.

Handwritten stop and frisk logs were requested from the 101st Precinct for May 25 through May 27 of 2008. Handwritten logs were received for May 21 through May 26 of 2008. There were no entries for May 27, 2008. The logs demonstrated that PO Ragoo regularly stopped individuals in the vicinity of the incident location and he consistently documented those stops.

§ 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (b) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (b) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

The three individuals PO Ragoo stopped at 56-10 Beach Channel Drive and one individual at Beach 54th Street and Beach Channel Drive occurred in the morning of May 26, 2008 as he worked overtime on May 25, 2008 and occurred before he went end of tour at 9:30AM on May 26, 2008. A stop and frisk report was requested for § 87(2)(b) who was stopped at the incident location, to confirm that the stop occurred in the morning before PO Ragoo went end of tour but there was no report for him.

Only six individuals were stopped at the incident location on different dates. On May 24, 2008, PO Jose Salazar, a Hispanic male, from the 101st Precinct stopped § 87(2)(b) at § 87(2)(b). On that same date, PO Thomas Mardiney, a white male from the 101st Precinct stopped § 87(2)(b).

Criminal Conviction History

A search in BADS beginning on January 1, 2004 revealed that § 87(2)(b) does not have any conviction history in the City of New York.

Civilian CCRB History

This is § 87(2)(b)'s first CCRB complaint.

Subject Officer CCRB History

PO Rago is a four year veteran with the NYPD. He has not been the subject of any CCRB substantiated allegations.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Pleading of Allegations

§ 87(2)(b) stated that he identified PO Ragoo by reading his name off of his uniform and he provided the correct spelling and pronunciation of his name when he filed the complaint. He also positively identified

him through a photo array and provided a matching description of PO Ragoo. PO Ragoo is the only officer within the NYPD with that last name. He also worked in that area at the time of the incident. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) insisted that the incident occurred on May 26, 2008, and went as far as providing a witness to confirm the incident date even though he was told that he had the wrong date. PO Ragoo's memo book indicated that he was RDO on that date and he did not recall interacting with § 87(2)(b) on any day. Despite the fact that § 87(2)(b) appears to be mistaken about the date or time of the incident, it is clear that the subject officer in his allegation is PO Ragoo. It is therefore recommended that allegations A through C be pled against him.

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Allegation A: PO Jason Ragoo questioned § 87(2)(b) on May 26, 2008.

Allegation B: PO Jason Ragoo frisked § 87(2)(b) on May 26, 2008.

Allegation C: PO Jason Ragoo searched § 87(2)(b) on May 26, 2008.

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Investigator:

Date:

Supervisor:

Date:

Reviewed by:

Date:

Reviewed by:

Date: